DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 253 CE 001 806

AUTHOR	Mattson, Robert E.; Rution, Joseph A.
TITLE	Considerations in Selection of Public Service Employers: The Vermont Experience. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Vermont State Employment Service, Montpelier. Dept. of Employment Security.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Research and Development.
REPORT NO	DLMA-82-48-70-30-4-FR
PUB DATE	Sep 73
NOTE	51p.; For related documents, see CE 001 805-818
AVAILABLE FROM	National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Child Care Occupations; Employer Employee Relationship; *Employment Opportunities; *Employment Programs; Health Occupations; *Job Satisfaction; Job Skills; Low Income Groups; *Occupational Mobility; Pilot Projects; *Public Service Occupations; Social Services; Supervision; Wages
IDENTIFIERS	Manpower Research; *Vermont

ABSTRACT

In a Public Service Employment program of subsidized work training, nonprofit employers in the areas of health, education, social services, and government can be evaluated in terms of the client's employability growth, wages, supervision, retention, transferability, and client satisfaction. Client employability increases in all four areas of employment, though slowly for classroom and day care aides. Wage levels are in the $2.00 to $2.40 range; they are highest for municipal employees, lowest for paraprofessional aides, with clericals in the middle. Clients seem generally satisfied with their jobs and with the supervision in all four areas. Retention is especially high in health, higher education, and government owing to large payroll, high turnover, wide job variety, reliable budgeting, and favorable employer attitude toward the program. Retention is low for classroom and day care aides because there are few openings and little turnover. A tight job market restricts transferability. (Also included is a three-item bibliography and a list of tables.) (Author)

ED 094253

CE

CONSIDERATIONS IN SELECTION

OF

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYERS:

THE VERMONT EXPERIENCE

Vermont Department of Employment Security

Madelyn Davidson, Commissioner

The Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project on the Special Work Project for the Unemployed and Upgrading for the Working Poor

September 1973

CE 001 806

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 094253

CONSIDERATIONS IN THE SELECTION OF PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYERS: THE VERMONT EXPERIENCE

This report was prepared for the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under research and development contract No. 82-48-70-30. Since contractors conducting research and development projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely, this report does not necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the Department of Labor. The contractor is solely responsible for the contents of this report.

Contract No. 82-48-70-30 funded the Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project on Special Work Projects for the Unemployed and Upgrading for the Working Poor. This Project was conducted by the Vermont Department of Employment Security, Madelyn Davidson, Commissioner. The principal authors of this monograph are Robert E. Mattson and Joseph A. Rution of the Vermont Department of Employment Security.

September, 1973

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. DLMA 82-48-70-30-4	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.

4. Title and Subtitle: CONSIDERATIONS IN THE SELECTION OF PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYERS: THE VERMONT EXPERIENCE

5. Report Date: SEP. 73

6.

7. Author(s): Robert E. Mattson and Joseph A. Rution, Vermont Department of Employment Security

8. Performing Organization Rept. No.

9. Performing Organization Name and Address:
Vermont Department of Employment Security
Box 488, Green Mountain Drive
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.

11. Contract/Grant No.: 82-48-70-30 DL

12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address:
U.S. Department of Labor
Manpower Administration
Office of Research and Development
1111 20th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210

13. Type of Report & Period Covered: Final: 11/1/70-6/30/73

14.

15. Supplementary Notes: Prepared as part of the Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project conducted by the Vermont Department of Employment Security

16. Abstracts: In a Public Service Employment program of subsidized work training, nonprofit employers in the areas of health, education, social services and government can be evaluated in terms of the client's employability growth, wages, supervision, retention, transferability, and client satisfaction. Client employability increases in all four areas of employment, though slowly for classroom and day care aides. Wage levels are in the $2.00 to $2.40 range; they are highest for municipal employees, lowest for paraprofessional aides, with clericals in the middle. Clients seem generally satisfied with their jobs and with the supervision in all four areas. Retention is especially high in health, higher education, and government owing to large payroll, high turnover, wide job variety, reliable budgeting, and favorable employer attitude toward the program. Retention is low for classroom and day care aides because there are few openings and little turnover. A tight job market restricts transferability.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors

Employment
Manpower

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

17c. COSATI Field/Group 5A, 5I

18. Availability Statement: Distribution is unlimited. Available from National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Va. 22151.

19. Security Class (This Report): UNCLASSIFIED

21. No. of Pages: 64

20. Security Class (This Page)

22. Price: 3.00

PREFACE

In mid-1970, as a consequence of welfare reform legislation then pending in the United States Congress, the Vermont Department of Employment Security was chosen to test and document experimentation in the manpower training aspects of the proposed legislation. The overall objective of the resulting Experimental and Demonstration (E&D) Manpower Pilot Project was to explore the feasibility and value of alternative approaches and procedures for conducting the Special Work Project (Public Service Employment) for the unemployed and Upgrading training for the working poor, as a means of helping to develop guidelines and other knowledge required to facilitate and make more effective national implementation and rapid expansion of manpower projects aimed at enhancing the employability of heads (and other members) of low-income families.

The project thus had two major components within the overall project:

- "Special Work Project" whereby unemployed persons, by performing work (at public and private nonprofit agencies in the public interest) can develop job skills which enable them to obtain nonsubsidized (private or public) employment,

- "Upgrading training" whereby low-income employed persons ("working poor") can develop new job skills for which they receive increased salary.

More specifically the project:

- developed various designs for operating the two manpower programs,

- tested operating practices to identify smooth running procedures,

- tested the feasibility and relative effectiveness of alternative operating procedures,

-identified problems and issues central to the establishment and running of these programs,

-prepared technical materials and other aids for use in the programs,

-monitored and evaluated outcomes of activities,

-determined requirements for administration, facilities, staff and financing of the programs,

-established guides for determining how these programs might fit into the overall mixture of manpower programs and services at the local level,

-developed the necessary guidelines and manuals for effectively replicating the programs elsewhere,

-researched and documented the effect of the program on E&D manpower clients and,

-produced monographs on salient aspects of project experience, relevant to planning activities at the national level for implementation of welfare reform and/or public service employment programs.

The project was initiated on July 1, 1970, and terminated on October 31, 1973. Operation of the project was divided into the following segments:

July 1, 1970, through October 31, 1970: Planning, initiation, and startup,

November 1, 1970, through June 30, 1971: Operations limited to Chittenden and Lamoille counties,

July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972: Statewide operations,

July 1, 1972, through June 30, 1973: Statewide operations,

July 1, 1973, through October 31, 1973: Evaluation, writing, printing and publishing.

FINAL TRAINEE SUMMARY			SPECIAL WORK	
As of July 2, 1973	Number	Number	Number	Percentage of Total Enrollees
Total Special Work Enrollments		656		100%
Completed Training		430		65.6%
-Completed, Placed in Employment	307			46.8%
-Completed, Placed in Work Training	26			4.0%
Total Placements			333	50.8%
-Completed, Placed in Education or Skill Training	6			0.9%
-Completed, Awaiting Placement	91			13.9%
Terminated Training		226		34.4%
-Good Cause	99			15.1%
-Without Good Cause	127			19.3%

FINAL TRAINEE SUMMARY		UPGRADING	
As of July 2, 1973	Number	Number	Percentage of Total Enrollees
Total Upgrading Enrollments		144	100%
-Completed Training		118	81.9%
Upgraded	114		79.2%
Not Upgraded	4		2.8%
-Terminated Training		26	18.0%
Good Cause	17		11.8%
Without Good Cause	9		6.2%

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	vii
List of Tables	xiii
Section I: Introduction	1
A. Background	2
B. Scope of Study	3
C. Methodology: A Caution Concerning Resource Data	5
Section II: Distribution of Types of Jobs and Employers	7
A. Types of Employers	7
B. Types of Jobs	7
C. Distribution of Jobs By Type of Employer	11
Section III: Training and Work Experience Potential	13
A. Employability Development: An Overview	13
B. Attitude of Employers	14
C. "World of Work" Orientation	19
D. Skill Training	20
Section IV: Wage Levels	23
A. Wages in Training	23
B. Changes in Earnings After Completion	23
C. Levels of Matching Funds	24
Section V: Supervisory Resources	27
A. Size of Group	27
B. Quality of Supervision	29
Section VI: Placement Rates and Transferability	33
A. Retentions	33
B. Duration of Placements	38
C. Transferability	38
Section VII: Job Satisfaction	41
Section VIII: Summary of Principal Conclusions	45
A. Distribution of Types of Jobs and Employers	45
B. Training/Work Experience Potential	46
C. Wage Levels	47
D. Supervisory Resources	48

Page

E. Placement Rates (Retention and Transferability)..48
F. Job Satisfaction.....50
G. Final Summary.....50

Bibliography.....53

LIST OF TABLES

Page

1. Distribution of Types of SWP Jobs By Types of Employers.....8

2. Distribution of Jobs and Employers By SIC and DOT Codes (one digit DOT Code) As of June 30, 1972.....9

3. Questions 26 & 37 -- Asked of SWP Counselors (re Completers and Terminators) From Booz-Allen Survey Data..15

4. Questions 35, 45, & 79 -- Asked of SWP Clients (46 presently employed) From Booz-Allen Survey Data...17

5. Changes in Completers' Wages -- Between Training Wage and 90 Days Thereafter (Dec. 1972).....25

6. Number of Employees Under Same Supervisor (As that of SWP Trainee) -- By Type of Employer -- Dec. 1972.....28

7. Question 91 -- Questions Asked of SWP Coaches (re 130 Completers and Terminators) From Booz-Allen Survey Data.....30

8. Question 20 -- Asked of Manpower Specialists (re 130 Completers and Terminators) -- From Booz-Allen Survey Data.....32

9. Placements (Retentions and Transfers) By Major Employer Category(12/4/72)(30 & 90 Day Status).....34

10. SWP Placements (Retentions and Transfers) By Employer Group Breakdown As Of 12/4/72 (30 & 90 Day Status).....35

11. Question 13(A) -- Asked of SWP Clients (130 Completers and Terminators)
Question 14 -- Asked of SWP Clients (130 Completers and Terminators)
Question 25 -- Asked of SWP Clients (re 130 Completers and Terminators).....42

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

The purpose of the Vermont Experimental and Demonstration Special Work Project (SWP) has been to test the effectiveness of subsidized Public Service Employment for low-income people as a vehicle for moving them into permanent, nonsubsidized employment. The "main goal" was to test the ability of such a program to "enhance the employability" of low-income family members. By enrolling eligible clients in SWP work experience "slots", the program sought to develop in these unemployed individuals the habits, attitudes, and work skills necessary for their entry into the regular employment market, and (incidently, though this was not a main project aim) develop marketable skills leading to nonsubsidized employment.

The device used was the creation of temporary, subsidized jobs (or Special Work "slots") with employers in the public and private, nonprofit sectors of the economy. The Vermont Department of Employment Security (DES) subsidized, for a limited period, the salary of eligible clients (generally, welfare-eligible unemployeds with children) for whom an employer would establish a job. The Manpower Specialists of the State Employment Service local offices were given the task of "selling" the program to employers and developing job slots.

Subcontracts for subsidized jobs were written to cover a period of approximately six months (but these subcontracts could be "renewed" as deemed appropriate, as many were). During the early stages of the program, the slots were not necessarily created with the intention of their becoming permanent, non-subsidized jobs upon the expiration of the subsidy period. The emphasis was changed, however, and placed upon developing mostly slots which had excellent prospects of becoming permanent jobs, or for which the employer would provide some degree of assurance that permanent employment would be offered to the enrollee successfully completing the subsidy period. The degree of subsidy was also flexible; the jobs could be subsidized up to 100%, but the Manpower Specialists developing the job slot subcontracts were expected to negotiate, in any effort, to have the employer pick up as much of the cost as he could "afford".

While the period of subsidized employment was regarded as a "training period" for the SWP employee (hereinafter referred to as the "client"), in actuality the main purpose of the program was to provide a "work experience" situation for him. The job of the Employment Service (ES) in the project was primarily to determine a client's eligibility; identify his barriers to employment; identify his supportive service needs; assist the client in identifying an employment goal and in developing an employability plan for reaching this goal; develop a job "slot" for him; and place him in it. Thus, no formal "skill training" situation was called for in the development of job slots. The aim of the program was not to impart vocational skills (although this resulted from many of the work situations -- some to a greater degree than others). Rather, the crux of the experiment was the placing of a disadvantaged unemployed immediately into an actual work situation (the "world of work") as a means of moving him into permanent, nonsubsidized employment.

One additional, important aspect of the program, but not a concern of this monograph, was the provision of extensive "support services" designed to assist him in participating in a regular work situation.

The success of such a venture could be measured in two ways. On the expiration of the "SWP slot" subcontract period the SWP employer might decide to retain the client, putting him on his payroll as a permanent employee, as a result of the employer's satisfaction with the client's performance during the subsidized employment period. On the other hand, the client could complete his tour of duty in the subsidized SWP slot and then successfully obtain work elsewhere on the open job market, presumably helped by work "orientation", new "work habits", etc., he obtained through his SWP experience.

Early in the program, a number of SWP slots were written in spite of the fact that they were not likely to develop into permanent jobs -- the slots being created for their value as

work experiences which would enhance the client's employability and facilitate his obtaining employment on the open job market ("transferability"). For various reasons, not the least of which was the unfavorable job market existing in Vermont at the time, this approach was abandoned and stress was placed upon developing slots with favorable prospects for "retentions".

A number of "monographs" are being developed as part of the E&D Project, many of them seeking to identify and isolate specific factors which might bear upon the success or failure of the Special Work program as a device for moving welfare-eligibles into jobs (success or failure measured in terms of either approach referred to above -- "retentions" or "transferability").

This monograph focuses on the Special Work employer (in this case, the public and nonprofit employer) as a possible factor in achieving the goal stated above. We draw upon the Vermont SWP experiences with approximately 145 different employers, with whom some 871 slots[1] have been created, within which (as of November 1, 1972)approximately 600 clients or "trainees" have served at least some period of subsidized employment (257 have "completed" the prescribed period of "training" or work experience; 135 are still in training; while 88 have terminated with good cause and 109 have terminated without good cause). The purpose of this monograph is to seek to determine if certain types of these employers might prove to be more "desirable" as SWP employers; that is, are certain types of employers better suited to the program's objective of providing low-income unemployeds with transition into permanent employment (either by "retaining" trainees permanently, or by enhancing their employability to the degree necessary for their "transfer" into other employment).

B. Scope of Study

Toward the end of determining the compatibility of certain types of employers[2] with the aims of a "SWP-type" manpower

[1]More than one client may go through a single "slot". For example, a slot might have been created for ten months, and two trainees may each have completed five month training periods in it, or one may have dropped out to be replaced by another, etc. Also, a slot may be "renewed" for the same trainee -- i.e., a trainee may spend six months in a slot which is renewed for another six months.

[2]While our main purpose is to analyze employers as potential SWP subcontractors, we will also look at the nature of the "job slots" (or work experience situations). Our main focus will still be upon the employer. However, the likelihood that one type of employer may be able to provide more "desirable" types of jobs (or job slots) will be a major factor in considering his suitability. We must consider also the possibility that an employer capable of providing many "desirable" types of job slots may be deemed an undesirable SWP prospect due to other of his characteristics.

program, this monograph will seek to isolate those factors or characteristics of the participating employers which might have a bearing on the question.

Specifically, the question of suitability of employers and work experience situations will be studied in light of the following considerations.

1. Training/Work Experience Potential. The various employer/subcontractors and the job slots or work experience situations provided by them will be evaluated in terms of their effectiveness in imparting skill training, good work habits, and generally beneficial orientation to the "world of work". As noted previously, skill training was not an objective of the program, but many of the job slots may have had the incidental effect of providing clients with new or sharpened skills. Booz-Allen and Hamilton, Inc. did an extensive survey of client and staff attitudes on the impact of the SWP program, and the survey data from that study will be drawn upon here.[3]

2. Wage Levels. We will study wage levels of SWP slots during the "training" period, and also the wage levels attained by project completers upon their "placement" (retention as permanent employees by SWP employer or obtaining of other employment on the job market). In other words, we will be trying to tell which work situations lead to more or less favorable income potentials. (This is important since a main aim of the project was to test the means of getting persons into employment which raises family income as far above welfare-eligibility limits as possible.)

   An incidental question to be touched upon briefly here is the possibility of a relationship between the desirability of an employer as a Special Work employer and the share of "slot" costs that the employer is willing to pay (i.e., do slots subsidized at say...50% prove more beneficial than those subsidized at 95%?)

3. Supervisory Resources. An attempt will be made here to evaluate the effectiveness or quality of the job slot supervision provided by the different employers involved in the program. Again, the Booz-Allen & Hamilton, Inc. study data will be drawn upon, as well as data gathered otherwise throughout the project.

---

[3] "Study of the Vermont Manpower Experimental and Demonstration Project", a report prepared by Booz-Allen Public Administration Services Inc., Washington, D. C. for the Vermont Department of Employment Security, September, 1973.

4. Placement Rates. This is probably the most critical area of inquiry of this monograph: the relationship between the different work experience situations (by employer and job category) and the placements ("successes") resulting from them. Placement rates (placements meaning "retentions" and "transfers") as well as duration of placements will be examined.

5. Transferability. To the degree possible, the question to be examined here is which work experience situations are most valuable in terms of imparting those skills or abilities which facilitate transfer into nonsubsidized employment (in jobs with an employer other than the SWP employer). This analysis will be severely limited by the fact that the project concentrated mainly upon, and attained a high degree of success in securing retentions, as well as the fact that the project period coincided with a very "tight" employment situation in Vermont, jobs generally being relatively scarce. As a result, cases of "transfer" were relatively few.

6. Job Satisfaction. The final question involves client preferences for particular types of SWP jobs or careers. Available project data will again be relied upon in answering this question.

C. Methodology: A Caution Concerning Resource Data.

Much of the background information and insights into specific questions for this report were provided through personal interviews with DES Manpower Specialists and Counselors in the field who were involved in the actual operations of the E&D Project.

However, this report will attempt to base its findings primarily upon the "hard" data which has been gathered throughout the project. A tremendous volume of such data has been collected and is available for analytical purposes. The problems encountered, however, were that available data, in many instances, was not precisely the type of data necessary to address the questions raised by this monograph, or it was not available in the most advantageous form. (The reason for this seems to be that the choice of data to be collected, as well as the form in which it was to be recorded, was made at the project's inception, long before the precise nature of the research and analysis was finally settled upon and, consequently, before the data needs of such research analysis could be evaluated.)

The nature of this problem is illustrated by the most common data application called for by this monograph. The various aspects of the work experience situations -- or Special Work slots -- this paper will focus upon (as outlined in "Scope," above) will be analyzed in terms of the particular job "categories" of the slots and "types" of employers they were subcontracted with. Information concerning job categories and types of employers was recorded in terms of Dictionary of

Occupational Titles (DOT) and Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Code Numbers. If the range of job slots and types of employers the project encompassed had been representative of jobs and employers in all segments of the economy -- public and private -- SIC and DOT Code numbers might have been appropriate to our data needs. However, SWP was involved only with employers in the public and private, nonprofit sectors (and, of course, only those jobs which such employers were able to provide). Special Work jobs and employers, in fact, did not span the full range of DOT and SIC categories, but tended to "bunch" heavily around certain few SIC and DOT categories. Since this study attempts distinctions and correlations based upon SIC and DOT identifying codes, the limitations are obvious. To compensate for this, some categorizing of job categories and types of employers along more revealing (for our purposes) lines was undertaken, but the manual process involved was too time consuming for extensive reorganization of data.

Analysis of the available data will be undertaken to whatever degree possible. Because of this fact, however, the conclusions drawn therefrom must be regarded as subjective observations of DES field staff, and Central Office personnel; the writer's personal knowledge of the project will be drawn upon extensively in interpreting the data.

SECTION II

DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF JOBS AND EMPLOYERS

Let us take a look at the types of employers with whom SWP jobs or "slots" were created, as well as the types of jobs and their distribution among the types of employers.

TABLE 1, which shows us types of jobs and types of employers by functional categories, and TABLE 2, which shows distribution of jobs and employers by DOT and SIC categories, respectively, give us an overall picture:

A. Types of Employers:

TABLE 1 shows us that the greatest percentage of slots were created in the category of "Education," which includes public and private schools, lower grades through college and professional levels (33%). TABLE 2 shows us that of these, by far the greatest number of slots were in the SIC category of "Elementary and Secondary Schools".

Almost as many slots were created in "Health and Allied Services," (29%). Looking at TABLE 2, we see that the overwhelming majority of these were in the SIC category of "State Government - Medical and Other Health Services" (which includes the Vermont State Hospital in Waterbury, accounting for the vast majority of all job slots in this category).

Next we find "Social Service and Day Care" which includes public and private day care and nursery facilities, and sundry forms of social service organizations, (19%).

Outside of these three major categories (Education, Health, and Social Services/Day Care), the other categories account for relatively small percentages of job slots. Of those remaining categories, "State Government" accounts for ten percent, "Municipal Government" five percent, and "Other" (which includes a military camp, housing cooperative, charitable fund raising groups, etc.), five percent.

B. Types of Jobs:

TABLE 1 shows us that the largest single percentage of all job slots were created in jobs categorized as "Professional Assistants and Aides", accounting for 36% of all jobs. This grouping includes such jobs as child care (day care) aides, teacher aides, nurses' aides -- slots which were very common

TABLE 1

Distribution of Types of SWP Jobs By Types of Employers

(As of March 10, 1972: Represents 70% of all slots developed to Nov., 1972)

	Clerical	Un-skilled Help	Semi-Skilled Help	Professional Assts. & Aides	Professional & Management	Total Slots % are of Total
Education	26 (16%)	41 (25%)	38 (23%)	53 (32%)	3 (2%)	166 (33%)
Social Service & Day Care	23 (24%)	4 (4%)	23 (24%)	35 (37%)	11 (11%)	96 (19%)
Health & Allied Services	24 (16%)	49 (33%)	7 (5%)	65 (44%)	4 (3%)	149 (29%)
State Gov't.	27 (53%)	4 (8%)	3 (6%)	15 (29%)	2 (4%)	51 (10%)
Municipal Gov't.	4 (17%)	5 (21%)	6 (25%)	9 (38%)	0 (0%)	24 (5%)
Other	5 (22%)	1 (4%)	14 (61%)	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	23 (5%)
TOTAL	109 (21%)	104 (20%)	91 (18%)	183 (36%)	22 (4%)	509 (100%)

1. Clerical: Includes clerk-typists, mail clerks, stock clerks, stenos, etc.

2. Unskilled: Includes messengers, laborer, maid, porter (kitchen), cook's helper, night watchman, groundskeeper, pantry girl, laboratory cleaner, etc.

3. Semi-skilled: Includes cook, baker, truck and bus driver, mason, maintenance man, key punch operator, painter, carpenter, electrician, switchboard operator, plumber, draftsman, machine operator, etc. These jobs are considered semi-skilled since SWP enrollees are "in-training" for these positions.

4. Professional Assistants and Aides: Includes child care aides, teacher aides, case aides, nurses' aides, rehabilitation aides, assistant sanitary inspector, day care workers, lab. assistant, researcher, nutrition aide, correction officer, etc.

5. Professional and Management: Includes social worker, office manager, governmental administrator, assistant program director, program coordinator, community organizer.

TABLE 2

Distribution of Jobs and Employers By
SIC Code and DOT Codes (One digit DOT Code)
As of June 30, 1972

SIC CODE AND TITLE OF EMPLOYER	DOT (1 Digit) Codes of Jobs										
	Total	Prof. Tech. & Mgt. 0 & 1		Clerical 2	Service 3	Agric. & Fishery 4	Process. 5	Machine Trades 6	Bench Work 7	Struc. Work 8	Misc. 9
General Bldg. Contractor 1511	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Second Hand Store 5933	15 (3%)	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	6 (40%)	2	4
Dentist & Dental Surgeon Office 8021	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hospital (private) 8061	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Health & Allied Services, NEC 8099	29 (5%)	0	23 (79%)	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Elementary & Secondary Schools 8211	123 (22%)	4	2	19 (15%)	89 (72%)	0	0	0	0	6	3
College, University or Professional School 8221	58 (10%)	13 (22%)	4	14 (25%)	9	2	0	0	0	16 (27%)	0
Schools & Educational Services, NEC 8299	15 (3%)	0	0	1	14 (93%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Business Assns. 8611	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civic, Social & Fraternal Assoc. 8641	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charitable Organizations 8671	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0
Nonprofit Mmbrship Organiz. NEC 8699	33 (6%)	0	8 (25%)	6 (19%)	6 (19%)	0	0	0	0	13 (38%)	0

TABLE 2 (cont'd)

SIC CODE AND TITLE OF EMPLOYER	DOT (1 Digit) Codes of Jobs										
	Total	Prof. Tech. & Mgt. 0 & 1		Clerical 2	Service 3	Agric. & Fishery 4	Process. 5	Machine Trades 6	Bench Work 7	Struc. Work 8	Misc. 9
Nonprofit Educ. & Sci. Research A.8921	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Govt.-Forest.9208	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
State Govt.-Personal Services 9272	21 (4%)	3	5	13 (62%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Govt.-Misc. Bus. Services 9273	22 (4%)	0	6	15 (68%)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
State Govt.-Medical & Other Health 9280	120 (22%)	3	26 (22%)	35 (29%)	56 (47%)	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Govt.-Legal Services 9281	6	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Govt.-Educational Serv. 9282	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Govt.-Misc. 9289	50 (9%)	0	21 (42%)	11 (22%)	9	0	0	2	0	7	0
State Govt.-Regular Govt. Functions: Exec., Legis. Judicial 9290	11	2	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	0
Local Govt.-Medical & Other Health Services 9380	7	0	3	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0
Local Govt.-Misc. Services 9389	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Local Govt.-Regular Govt. Functions: Exec. Legis. Judic. 9390	24 (4%)	1	0	3	10 (42%)	1	0	1	0	5	3
TOTAL	556	30 (5%)	102 (18%)	136 (25%)	206 (37%)	5 (1%)	0 (0%)	4 (1%)	7 (1%)	56 (10%)	10 (2%)

throughout the project. (TABLE 2 shows most of these jobs under the DOT category of "Service Occupations".)

Most of the remaining job slots are distributed fairly evenly among the three categories "Clerical" (21%), "Unskilled Help" (20%), and "Semi-Skilled Help", actual training positions leading to skilled jobs, (18%). Four percent of the slots came under the category of "Professional and Management".

C. Distribution of Jobs by Type of Employer

Now, we will look at how the various types of jobs that were developed during the project were distributed with each type of employer.

1. Education: Most jobs in education were "Professional Assistants and Aides" (32%), teacher aides being the most common job developed in this area. Next were "Unskilled Help", a good number of porters and janitors (25%); followed by "Semi-Skilled", bus drivers, maintenance personnel (23%); and "Clerical" (16%). There were very few "Professional and Management" slots in this, or for that matter, any other category.

2. Social Service and Day Care: "Professional Assistants and Aides" were the most common types of slots here at 37% (accounting for the great many day care aide jobs, as well as rehabilitation aides and case aides). "Clerical" and "Semi-Skilled" jobs each accounted for 24% (a good number of trades-related jobs were developed with OEO-funded enterprises). "Professional and Management" jobs accounted for 11%, the highest percentage of "Professional and Management"jobs in any of the employer categories (professional and highly responsible administrative jobs were possible with smaller, social service organizations, such as Community Action Agencies). "Unskilled" help accounted for only four percent of the slots.

3. Health and Allied Services: The highest percentage of slots here (44%) were for "Professional Assistants and Aides", most being aides of various types (nurses' aides and case aides, nutrition and rehabilitation aides). "Unskilled Help" accounted for 33% (representing a good number of service-type jobs with hospitals and health facilities, i.e., laundry aides, cooks' helpers, etc.). "Clerical" accounted for 16%, with very few "Semi-Skilled" (five percent) or "Professional and Management" (three percent) jobs.

4. State Government: The majority of the slots developed here were for "Clerical" jobs (53%). "Professional Assistants and Aides" (a good number of Social Welfare, Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment Service Aides)

came to 29%, eight percent unskilled help, with few in the other categories.

5. Municipal Government: There were too few job slots developed in local government to allow for any generalizations concerning distribution of types of jobs. This would seem unusual, in light of the fact that municipal government in recent years has evidenced a critical need for manpower in a very wide range of occupational fields. The most plausible explanation -- and one voiced by Manpower Specialists in the field -- has been availability of manpower under the Emergency Employment Act (EEA), the funding of which roughly coincided with the initiation of the E&D Special Work program. That program apparently satisfied local government's need for temporarily subsidized help over the duration of the Special Work program.

The above analysis gives us insights into the following questions: First, with which types of employers can we expect to develop job slots? Secondly, what types of jobs can we expect to develop with each different type of employer? Those questions can be of significance if we are able to identify a certain type of employer as particularly "desirable" from the standpoint of the aims of a program like SWP. By the same token, should we have preference for a certain type of job, we can get an idea as to which type of employers we should turn to for the development of the highest number of such jobs.

SECTION III

TRAINING AND WORK EXPERIENCE POTENTIAL

One purpose of the project was to test temporary subsidized employment with public and nonprofit employers as a means to prepare the unemployed, disadvantaged person for a permanent work situation: providing him with "orientation" to the "world of work". A somewhat ancillary purpose was to assist him in the acquisition of some skills of value in competing on the open job market. This chapter will seek indicators as to which types of (public and private, nonprofit) employers and jobs are most capable of serving these purposes.

The primary source of information and data will come from tabulated responses to a series of questions asked of 130 randomly chosen clients in the Booz-Allen Client Survey who had passed through the project (80 terminators and 50 completers). Interviews with SWP staff were also conducted by Booz-Allen and will provide background for the interpretation of data.

A. Employability Development: An Overview

The primary criteria for success of a work experience situation (or "slot") is its impact upon the employability development of the client: Does it help him land and keep a permanent job?

Employability development, as used by the E&D Project, is a step or steps in overall employability goal of the client. When an E.S. Counselor has determined with the client, after thorough examination and reflection, what the primary employment goal for the particular individual should be, he then directs the person on this course through the vehicle of a Special Work slot. A Special Work employer who assists the client in becoming self-sufficient in terms of relying on himself in the solution of problems, in improving his self-image and value as an employee and respect for the work being done can contribute immeasurably to enhance his employability. These factors are difficult to evaluate from statistical data, for they are subjective and only the people involved can see first hand where they exist and to what degree.

TABLE 3 shows the responses to the pointed question (put to SWP Counselors) of whether or not the slot contributed to "long-range employability". The data indicates the following:

-Jobs in pre-college education (most of which were classroom aide jobs) rate low in enhancing employability development.

-Jobs in colleges, on the other hand, rate fairly high (jobs in colleges tended to be greatly varied).

-Social Service related jobs (many of which are found in employer categories - 6, 9, 10, 12, 13 and DOT categories 0&1) tended to be viewed as beneficial. (Many of these jobs are with small agencies and organizations serving the needs of people on an individualized basis).

-Clerical work was deemed a very effective employability enhancer (clerical jobs were scattered among varied types of employers).

-Professional, technical and managerial fields were felt to be fairly effective (many of these jobs were of the so-called "paraprofessional" type, a field that will be the subject of close attention in another monograph).

-"Service" jobs (many unskilled jobs in food service, maintenance work, etc.) were deemed undesirable in this regard.

-The views of 46 SWP completers, now holding jobs, as to how beneficial the SWP experience was to them in securing their present jobs (TABLE 4) are consistent with the above observations (with the exception of the five clients interviewed who had SWP jobs in colleges -- a sample too small to be considered representative).

Beyond this, the data is too limited to permit further generalizations as to types of jobs and employers. Interviews with staff personnel, however, were very helpful in adding to and interpreting the above considerations.

B. Attitude of Employers

(For study of trainee/supervisor relationships, see chapter on "Supervisory Resources".) SWP field personnel -- Manpower Specialists, Counselors and Coaches who had daily contact with SWP job situations -- felt that the attitudes of employers and their supervisory personnel were very important in determining the value of a SWP experience to the client. Consider the circumstances of clients typically enrolled in SWP and the importance of favorable attitude is clear: Many were disadvantaged, all welfare-eligible, some having little employment experience, most with some "barriers" to employment. Potentially delicate situations are bound to arise where the attitude of

TABLE 3

Questions 26 & 37 -- Asked of SWP Counselors
(Re 130 Completers and Terminators)
From Booz-Allen Survey Data

TYPE OF EMPLOYER	YES	NO	TOTAL*
Education (1-12) (1)	12 (36%)	19 (58%)	33
Education (College) (2)	12 (71%)	5 (29%)	17
Hospital (3)	36 (51%)	34 (48%)	71
Other Health (4)	4 (44%)	4 (44%)	9
State Government - Health (5)	1	0	1
State Government - Voc. Rehab.(6)	2	1	3
Child Care - Day Care (7)	4 (50%)	2 (25%)	8
CAA - Day Care (8)	1	2	3
CAA - Other (9)	6	0	6
Social Services (10)	2	0	2
State Government - Social Services (11)	0	0	0
State Government - DES (12)	3	0	3
Youth Services (13)	1	0	1
Charitable/Nonprofit Fund Raising (14)	1	0	1
Legal Services (15)	0	1	1
State Government - Other (16)	4 (44%)	3 (33%)	9
City Government (17)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	6
Regional Level (18)	1	0	1
Other (19)	5	7	11

Q: "Do you think this slot contributed to the long-range employability development of this client?"

*Total includes other responses

TABLE 3 (CONT'D)

TYPE OF JOB (1 Digit DOT Code)	YES	NO	TOTAL*
Professional, Technical and Managerial (0&1)	21 (62%)	10 (29%)	34
Clerical and Sales (2)	28 (82%)	3 (9%)	34
Service (3)	38 (42%)	50 (56%)	90
Farming, Fishery, Forestry and Related (4)	2	2	4
Processing (5)	0	0	0
Machine Trades (6)	2	1	3
Bench Work (7)	0	0	0
Structural Work (8)	7 (33%)	14 (67%)	21
Miscellaneous (9)	0	0	0

Q: "Do you think this slot contributed to the long range employability development of this client?"

the employer will have a direct bearing upon the outcome.

Summarized below are comments of field staff on this matter:

-To identify potential attitudinal problems, one must contact actual worksite supervisors: attitude here often differs from that of the employers' "front office" i.e., Management who negotiated the subcontract may have a positive attitude toward helping the disadvantaged while the immediate supervisor, who "pulled himself up by the boot straps", may be apathetic toward this group.)

-Cases of anti-welfare philosophy and unsympathetic attitudes toward "welfare-types" arise occasionally (most common incidents mentioned were in very rural schools and among supervisors of low-level, unskilled jobs such as janitorial work). It was felt that such cases could, and should, be "weeded-out" at the inception by tactful and perceptive Manpower Specialists.

-Attitudes within Social Service related employers, and agencies involved in serving personal needs of low-

TABLE 4

Questions 35, 45 & 79 -- Asked of SWP Clients
(46 Presently Employed)
From Booz-Allen Survey Data

TYPE OF EMPLOYER	YES	NO	TOTAL*
Education (1-12) (1)	0	5	5
Education (College) (2)	0	5(100%)	5
Hospital (3)	16 (80%)	4(20%)	20
Other Health (4)	1	1	2
State Government - Health (5)	0	0	0
State Government - Voc. Rehab. (6)	0	2	2
Child Care - Day Care (7)	0	1	1
CAA - Day Care (8)	0	2	2
CAA - Other (9)	0	0	0
Social Services (10)	0	0	0
State Government - Social Services (11)	0	0	0
State Government - DES (12)	1	0	1
Youth Services (13)	0	0	0
Charitable/Nonprofit Fund Fund Raising (14)	0	0	0
Legal Services (15)	0	0	0
State Government - Other (16)	0	1	1
City Government (17)	1	1	2
Regional Level (18)	0	0	0
Other (19)	1	4	5

Q: "Do you think your SWP work experience was helpful in getting your present job?"

TABLE 4 (CONT'D)
Questions #35, 45 & 79 - Asked of SWP Clients

(46 Presently Employed)
From Booz-Allen Survey Data

TYPE OF JOB (1 Digit DOT Code)	YES	NO	TOTAL
Professional, Technical and Managerial (0&1)	2	2	4
Clerical and Sales (2)	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	10
Service (3)	9 (41%)	13 (59%)	22
Farming, Fishery, Forestry and Related (4)	0	1	1
Processing (5)	0	0	0
Machine Trades (6)	0	0	0
Bench Work (7)	0	0	0
Structural Work (8)	3 (33%)	6 (67%)	9
Miscellaneous (9)	0	0	0

Q: "Do you think your SWP work experience was helpful in getting your present job?"

income, disadvantaged or "problem" individuals tend to be very favorable.

-Organizations and jobs motivated primarily by considerations of "efficiency" (procedural precision, economy of operations, etc.) are much less likely to possess favorable attitudes toward SWP and SWP clients than those oriented toward serving the needs of people and solving personal problems. The actual job is important here; for example, the attitudes surrounding the work situation of a case aide in a Social Welfare agency may be quite different than those encountered by a client working in the same agency's stockroom.

-In discussing prospects for extending the SWP project into private, profit-making sectors, many expressed reservations based on the feeling that the public and private, nonprofit sectors are much more likely to have "humanistic" attitudes (field staff have experience in working in both sectors with various Manpower programs).

One question asked of clients was how satisfied they were with the "people they worked with." Responses were positive -- in excess of 70% -- in all employer categories, indicating that satisfaction with co-workers was uniformly high.

C. "World of Work" Orientation

As previously mentioned, a project goal was to test the capability of subsidized work situations as a factor in instilling good work habits, orienting clients toward the demands of the "world of work" and a daily job routine.

A word of caution here: the job situations provided by SWP can only be evaluated on the basis of client outcomes if, in fact, lack of "work orientation" is the main problem of the clients put into these jobs.

This, in fact, was not necessarily the case. A good percentage of the clients had considerable work experience and solid work histories; their problems lay in other unresolved "barriers" to employment or an unfavorable job market.

A client survey did not focus upon the question of work orientation in terms of specific types of employers and jobs. Therefore, the following is a summary of field staff observations on the matter:

> -For a person definitely lacking in familiarity with the "world of work," jobs with very definite, structured daily routines and schedules can be effective in imparting desirable basic work habits (for example, bus driver, office clerk, maintenance man).
>
> -For clients capable of responsibly handling a less structured, flexible work situation, "paraprofessional" jobs, involving serving needs and problems of people on an individual basis, can be of value in improving morale and motivation. (For example, social service agency or Employment Service case aides, outreach workers, planned parenthood caseworker trainees, etc.) The feeling is that jobs involving dealing with the problems of others have a therapeutic effect, helping the client to either forget or better deal with his own problems, raising morale, expectations, inspiring self-confidence, etc. (The subject of "paraprofessional" slots will be the subject of another monograph in this series.[4])

---

[4] Robert Stanfield, The Uses of Paraprofessionals In the Delivery of Manpower and Social Services Through Public Service Employment: The Vermont Experience (Vermont: Vermont Department of Employment Security, 1973)

-Day care and classroom aide jobs are not particularly beneficial, especially to the unemployed mothers typically filling these slots. The daily drudgery of tending to young children is too much like the at-home situation to inspire any changes in attitude or viewpoint toward the "world of work."

-On the other hand, clerical jobs are seen as effective in raising expectations and improving grooming and working habits. Trainees find getting dressed up daily and participating in a "formal" office situation a source of "status" and pride. Conversely, many service-type jobs lack this appeal.

-Counselors feel that 'make-work" jobs have much less impact upon trainees' work orientation than do jobs the trainee can perceive as meaningful work -- in which he can see a "future" for himself -- and should therefore be avoided. For this reason, they voiced an interest in seeing SWP expanded to the private, profit-making sector, where a much broader range of jobs can be developed, especially jobs relating to trainees' past work experience and interest.

D. Skill Training

Although the emphasis of SWP work situations was not toward imparting actual job skills, questions 36, 46 and 80 of The Booz-Allen client survey (put to 47 completers now in permanent jobs) asked, "Did you learn any skills in your SWP job you are using in your present job?" The responses reflect this lack of skill training emphasis in the project. Forty of the 47 or 85%, answered "no". However, of the seven who answered positively, five of them were employed in clerical jobs. This reinforces an almost unanimous observation voiced by field staff: clerical work was the one area where the project provided valuable job-skill training.

Another question, 30, asked of actual job supervisors of 130 completers and terminators in the Booz-Allen Client Survey: "Were clients' skills improved during his project experience?" The reply was "yes" for the majority of clients, close to 60%, but there was no significant variation in replies among different types of employers or jobs. Ergo, employer or job-type was not a particularly significant determinant of the trainee's ability to improve his job skills.

A couple of recurring comments by SWP field staff are pertinent and deserve mention:

-If skill training is to be a major element in a SWP-type employment program (which it patently was not in the present project), the variation of jobs should be greatly expanded to reflect more closely the variation of jobs on the entire job market

(private profit-making as well as public and private, non-profit). Transferability of employment to the private, profit-making sector being one of the goals of the present project, the range of jobs was not sufficient to adequately test its capabilities in this regard. If the purpose, on the other hand, is purely to increase the number of jobs in the public and private, nonprofit sectors, then the program should seek to create new jobs by expanding employers' range of activities, rather than simply expanding the number of existing types of jobs (i.e., create new public service jobs by creating new or expanded public service roles).

-Large, higher education institutions, such as the University of Vermont, can be excellent sources of skill-teaching slots, since the range of available jobs there approaches that of the economy at large.

SECTION IV

WAGE LEVELS

A. Wages in Training

Available data tells us nothing really significant concerning which types of SWP employers or jobs are likely to pay higher (or poorer) wages during training. Project statistics reveal that almost all in-training wages fall into the $2.00-$2.40 per hour range, the majority falling between $2.00-$2.20. By far the most common training wage is $2.00/hr. Very few jobs paid less than $2.00/hr.

Looking at TABLE 5, we see (by types of employers) that the range of mean training wages paid is $1.80 to $2.78, but most of these are bunched into the $2.00 to $2.20 range. An interpretation of this data permits the following generalizations:

-Wages in industries employing trainees in child-tending and classroom aide capacities (day care facilities and public schools) tend to pay low; pretty close to the $2.00 level.

-City government wages (though project experience with cities and towns was very limited) tended to be high. Municipal operations offer a wide range of jobs and municipal wages tend to be competitive with those in private industry.

-Caterories employing high percentages of clerical workers show wages paid in this field tend to be in the mid-range ($2.00 - $2.30). ("State Government - Other" is such a category.)

The variations of pay rates within job and employer categories are too great to allow for any more specific findings than these.

B. Changes in Earnings After Completion

TABLE 5 also gives us percentages of change (increase or decrease) in earnings of placed completers 90 days after they left SWP training, i.e., the differences between their in-training wages and their rates 90 days thereafter.

Overall (for those ex-trainees employed after 90 days on whom information was available) the figures show an average (mean) increase of 11%, median increase of six percent.

Unfortunately, the data available does not permit us to make any safe generalizations as to the potential of any SWP job or employer type in modifying earning power. The quantity of data is not sufficient for an adequate sample, too many other variables are involved, and a 90 day time period is not a sufficient length of time to give any indications of long-range project impact (180 day "follow-through" data was not available in sufficient quantity at the time of this writing).

The only observation that can be made of the data portrayed in TABLE 5 is this: In those employer categories for which any substantial amount of information is available (education, hospitals and health, CAA's), changes in earning over 90 days are fairly negligible.

C. Levels of Matching Funds

The SWP Project made available to employer/subcontractors up to 100% of the costs of Special Work slots during the duration of the subcontract, but the employers were to be required to pay as great a share of the cost as they could.

In theory, the ability or willingness of an employer to "pick-up" a higher share of the subcontract cost could be an excellent indicator of that employer's ability/willingness to retain trainees upon expiration of the subsidy period.

Unfortunately, throughout the entire project there were but a handful of subcontracts written for less than 90% subsidy (most being either 90 to 100%), and of these few, no pattern was evident upon which to base even speculation. Manpower Specialists (who negotiated subcontracts) in some instances admitted that the question of employer share of costs was not approached as a serious bargaining point.

TABLE 5

CHANGES IN COMPLETERS' WAGES -- BETWEEN TRAINING WAGE AND 90 DAYS THEREAFTER (DEC. 1972)

TYPE OF EMPLOYER	No. for Whom Information Available	Decrease						No Change	Increase						Median % of Change	Mean % of Change	Mean Training Wage
		Over 30%	21-30%	16-20%	11-15%	6-10%	1-5%		1-5%	6-10%	11-15%	16-20%	21-30%	Over 30%			
Education (1-12)	21						1	10	1	2	3	1		3	0%	8%	$2.07
Education (College)	12							4	5			1		2	+4%	+14%	2.21
Hospital	35			2	2	1		10	4	7	5	1	1	2	+6%	+ 5%	2.08
Other Health	11				1	1		5		1	1			2	0	+11%	2.32
State Gov't - Health	2							2							0	0	2.18
State Gov't - Voc. Rehab.	2												1	1	+35%	+35%	2.50
Child Care - Day Care	7			1				1	1		3			1	+13%	+ 8%	1.95
Community Action Agency Day Care	1													1	+47%	+47%	1.97
CAA - Other	9	2		1	1	1		3		1					-10%	-14%	2.42
Social Services	3	1						2							0	- 8%	1.99
State Gov't - Social Services	4							1						3	+25%	+19%	2.12
State Gov't - DES	4							2			1			1	+ 6%	+ 5%	2.09
Youth Services	1							1							0	0	2.00
Charitable/Nonprofit Fund Raising	1				1										-15%	-15%	2.00
Legal Services	1										1				+14%	+14%	1.80
State Gov't - Other	11	1						8		2					0	- 3%	2.25
City Gov't	4							2						2	+18%	+37%	2.78
Regional Development	3							1				2			+18%	+12%	2.00
Other	4						1				2			1	+13%	+26%	2.07
TOTALS	136							52							+ 6%	+11%	

SECTION V

SUPERVISORY RESOURCES

Now we will focus on the availability of "supervisory resources": clues as to the quantity and quality of supervision rendered by various types of SWP employers.

A. Size of Group

TABLE 6 seeks to show us patterns, by employer, of the size of the groups of workers (of which the SWP trainee is a member) under a single supervisor (that is, the supervisor-to-employee ratio). The following are salient observations:

-The vast majority of all jobs (67%) were evenly distributed in the two to five and six to ten employees-per-supervisor range.

-The jobs having the highest frequency of one-to-one supervisor/trainee ratio were in lower education (many classroom aides), 17%; State Government; and in the Community Action Agency (CAA) (non-day care) jobs, 13%.

-Those jobs tending toward highest supervisor-to-employee ratio (over ten employees per supervisor) were in "hospitals" (most of these slots were in the large State Hospital at Waterbury), 29%, and "State Government - Other" (having a high percentage of clerical jobs), 35%.

-Those jobs tending toward lower supervisor-to-employee ratios (fewer than six employees per supervisor) were "Other Health" (small health-related services organizations and agencies), 60%; State Government (categories #5, 6, 11, 12, and 16), 60%; "City Government", 57%; and "Education 1-12, 44%. (It should be pointed out that State offices tended to fall at either end of the spectrum, with very few in the middle range.)

(NOTE: While there are a couple of other apparently notable statistics on TABLE 6, they are subject to misinterpretation due to peculiarities in the data collection methods used, and have therefore been passed over.)

TABLE 6

Number of Employees Under Same Supervisor
(As that of SWP Trainee)
By Type of Employer - December 1972

	No. Slots*	No. Employees Under Same Supervisor				
		1	2-5	6-10	11-20	Over 20
Education (1-12)(1)	157	26 (17%)	42 (27%)	38 (24%)	28 (18%)	15 (9%)
Education (Coll)(2)	76	2 (3%)	36 (47%)	23 (30%)	11 (14%)	2 (3%)
Hospital (3)	215	5 (2%)	16 (8%)	131 (61%)	63 (29%)	0
Other Health (4)	65	4 (6%)	35 (54%)	19 (29%)	0	0
State Gov't.-Hlth.(5)	26	0	17	9	0	0
State Gov't.- Voc. Rehab. (6)	17	0	10	7	0	0
Child Care- Day Care (7)	51	3 (6%)	25 (49%)	12 (24%)	3 (6%)	6 (12%)
CAA-Day Care (8)	5	2	1	0	0	0
CAA - Other (9)	46	6 (13%)	31 (67%)	7 (15%)	1 (2%)	0
Social Services (10)	10	0	5	4	1	0
State Gov't. - Soc. Services (11)	21	2	4	9	3	1
State Gov't.-DES (12)	40	13 (33%)	13 (33%)	10 (25%)	2 (5%)	1 (2%)
Youth Services (13)	2	0	2	0	0	0
Charitable/Nonprofit Fund Raising (14)	8	5	3	0	0	0
Legal Services (15)	8	0	8	0	0	0
State Gov't.-Other(16)	44	3 (7%)	20 (45%)	5 (11%)	13 (30%)	2 (5%)
City Gov't. (17)	32	4	11	3	6	5
Regional Devlpt.(18)	5	1	4	0	0	0
Other (19)	43	6 (14%)	12 (28%)	6 (14%)	18 (42%)	0
TOTAL	871	82 (9%)	295 (34%)	283 (33%)	149 (17%)	32 (4%)

*Includes unfilled slots (compilations are only for filled slots).

B. Quality of Supervision

In the Booz-Allen Survey, series of questions were put to SWP field staff asking their opinion of the supervisors of 130 project completers and terminators. The responses to questions concerning the following traits of the supervisor have been tabulated: the amount of time he spent with the client, his understanding of clients' problems, his willingness to help client, his attitude toward client, how well he helped client learn new skills, and his interest in the client. TABLE 7 presents the tabulations of replies by SWP Coaches (the staff member felt to be most familiar with the supervisors). From this data, the following observations can be made:

-The majority of supervisors of each type of employer scored consistently satisfactorily in every aspect of the question (most categories falling within the 44-65% range, with no significant variation between them), with the exception of "Other Health," which scored consistently low. Since, however, there were but six samples in this latter category, no generalization concerning this type of employer are justified. (Nor did interviews with field staff support the data on this point.)

-Hospitals - in this project, the primary experience being the State Hospital at Waterbury - were deemed to be excellent as far as willingness to help the client and teaching of skills. This was corroborated by field staff interviews. This makes sense: being a mental institution, its business is attending to problems of individuals.

While the data is insufficient as a basis for any further observations, it should be noted that "satisfied" responses outnumbered "dissatisfied" in all categories for all questions, with the above "Other Health" exception.

TABLE 8 shows responses from Booz-Allen Survey of Manpower Specialists to the question: "Do you think the employer and supervisor were adequately prepared for dealing with the problems the client brought to the job?"

As they did in the preceeding series of questions, all categories of employers scored high (including, this time, "Other Health"), in fact consistently higher than in the preceeding series. With the exception of Hospitals (the State Hospital providing the primary experience), which scored exceptionally high, there is not sufficient variation in the data to permit generalizations regarding any particular types of employers. The data seems to say that of all the employers subcontracted with during SWP, most were prepared to deal with the problems the clients brought to the job. (Bear in mind

TABLE 7

Question 91 - Questions Asked of SWP Coaches (re 130 Completers and Terminators)
From Booz-Allen Survey Data

	A			B			C		
	Satis'd	Dissat'd	Total*	Satis'd	Dissat'd	Total*	Satis'd	Dissat'd	Total*
Education (1-12)(1)	15 (68%)	3 (14%)	22	12 (54%)	2	22	15(68%)	3 (14%)	22
Education (Coll.)(2)	6 (20%)	0	10	6 (60%)	0	10	6(60%)	0	10
Hospital (3)	29 (63%)	1 (2%)	46	27 (59%)	4 (97%)	46	33(72%)	0	46
Other Health (4)	2 (33%)	3 (50%)	6	1 (17%)	3 (50%)	6	2(33%)	2 (33%)	6
State Gov't.-Hlth(5)	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
State Gov't.-V. R.(6)**	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
Child Care, Day (7)	4	0	6	4	0	6	4	0	6
CAA-Day Care (8)	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
CAA-Other (9)	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Social Serv. (10)	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
State Gov't.-S. S.(11)***	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Gov't.-DES (12)	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
Youth Services (13)	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
Char./Nonprofit Fund Raising (14)	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Legal Services (15)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Gov't.-Other (16)	4	0	5	3	1	5	3(60%)	1	5
City Gov't. (17)	3	0	5	2	1	5	1(20%)	0	5
Region. Develop.(18)	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Other (19)	3	1	8	3	0	8	4	0	8

QUESTION A. "I would like to know your opinion of client's SWP Supervisor as far as the amount of time he spent with the client."

B. "I would like to know your opinion of client's Supervisor as far as his understanding of client's problems."

C. "I would like to know your opinion of client's Supervisor as far as his willingness to help client."

*Total includes other responses.

**V. R. -- Vocational Rehabilitation

***S. S. -- Social Services

TABLE 7 (Cont'd)

Question 91 - Questions Asked of SWP Coaches (re 130 Completers and Terminators) From Booz-Allen Survey Data

	D			E			H		
	Satis'd	Dissat'd	Total*	Satis'd	Dissat'd	Total*	Satis'd	Dissat'd	Total*
Education (1-12) (1)	14 (64%)	3 (14%)	22	12 (55%)	3 (14%)	22	13 (59%)	4 (18%)	22
Education (Coll.) (2)	6 (60%)	0	10	5 (50%)	0	10	6 (60%)	0	10
Hospital (3)	30 (65%)	1 (2%)	46	33 (72%)	1 (27%)	46	26 (57%)	3 (7%)	46
Other Health (4)	1	3	6	0	2 (33%)	6	1 (17%)	3 (50%)	6
State Gov't.-Hlth. (5)	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
State Gov't.-V.R. (6)**	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
Child Care, Day (7)	4	0	6	5	0	6	5	0	6
CAA-Day Care (8)	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	1
CAA-Other (9)	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Social Serv. (10)	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1
State Gov't.-S.S. (11)***	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
State Gov't.-DES (12)	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
Youth Services (13)	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
Char./Nonprofit Fund Raising (14)	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1
Legal Services (15)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Gov't.-Other (16)	3	1	5	4	0	5	3	1	5
City Gov't. (17)	2	1	5	3	0	5	2	1	5
Region. Develop. (18)	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Other (19)	3	0	8	3	0	8	3	0	8

QUESTION D. "I would like to know your opinion of client's Supervisor as far as his attitude toward client."

E. "I would like to know your opinion of client's Supervisor as far as how well he helped client to learn new skills."

H. "I would like to know your opinion of client's Supervisor as far as his interest in client."

*Total includes other responses.

**V. R. -- Vocational Rehabilitation

***S. S. -- Social Services

that a large number of clients brought no real problems to the job, and many brought problems, the solutions to which were beyond the capacities of any employer.)

One common pertinent observation of field staff should be mentioned in closing this chapter. It was felt that the most beneficial employers from the standpoint of resources available to serve a SWP client's needs were those either or (both):

-Large, and therefore having access to many resources (e.g., State Government).

-Social service oriented, and therefore in the business of serving the problems of people (e.g., the State Hospital, OEO, Community Action Agency).

TABLE 8

Question 20 - Asked of Manpower Specialists
(re 130 Completers and Terminators)
From Booz-Allen Survey Data

TYPE OF EMPLOYER	YES	NO	TOTAL*
Education (1-12) (1)	17 (74%)	2 (9%)	23
Education (College) (2)	6 (75%)	1 (13%)	8
Hospital (3)	45 (98%)	1 (2%)	46
Other Health (4)	4 (67%)	2 (33%)	6
State Government - Health (5)	1	0	1
State Gov't. - Voc. Rehab. (6)	2	0	2
Child Care - Day Care (7)	4	1	5
CAA - Day Care (8)	2	0	3
CAA - Other (9)	5	0	5
Social Services (10)	0	0	1
State Gov't.-Social Services (11)	0	0	0
State Gov't.-DES (12)	1	0	1
Youth Services (13)	1	0	1
Charitable/Nonprofit Fund Raisg(14)	1	0	1
Legal Services (15)	0	0	0
State Gov't - Other (16)	5	0	5
City Gov't (17)	3	1	5
Regional Level (18)	1	0	1
Other (19)	8	2	11

Q: "Do you think the employer and supervisor were adequately prepared for dealing with the problems that this client brought to the job?"

* Total includes other responses

SECTION VI

PLACEMENT RATES AND TRANSFERABILITY

We are seeking here indicators of trends in placements of completers of SWP training in various types of jobs and with the various types of employers. We are really talking about two things, so let us define our terms. The placements in which we are interested are placements of completed SWP trainees in permanent, nonsubsidized jobs. These are of two types. The first we will call "retentions": the SWP employer/subcontractor takes on the trainee (upon completion) as a permanent employee. This has been the primary aim or direction of the SWP project. The second situation we will call "transfer": a completer, while not being placed or retained with the SWP employer is successful in landing a permanent, nonsubsidized job with another employer.

Let's look at our available data to see if there are any clues as to which types of employers or jobs are more (or less) successful in leading to retentions or transfers.

A. Retentions

TABLE 9 tells us what happened to training completers 30 and 90 days after they completed. (TABLE 10 breaks down the employer categories further). The most striking statistic is the placement rates in "Health and Allied Services". Its 68% retention rate (at 30 days) is far higher than any other category. A look at the more detailed breakdown on TABLE 10 shows that most of these placements are attributable to hospitals. In fact, most of these slots were at the Vermont State Hospital in Waterbury. (Throughout the project, very little success in subcontracting for job slots with private hospitals was attained, hospitals being generally unreceptive to the program; the State Hospital in Waterbury was the notable exception.)

While there were far fewer completers than in the hospital, "Other Health" shows a healthy retention rate (57%). Most of these slots have been with small health-related agencies such as community mental health programs, Planned Parenthood, Vermont Dental Care, and Visiting Nurse Association.

There seem to be reasons for the apparent success in the hospital and health service agency areas. Since the range of jobs with these employers has been wide (the hospital providing a surprisingly wide variety) the answer lies with employer-

TABLE 9

Placements (Retentions & Transfers) By Major Employer Category (12/4/72)
(30 and 90 Day Status)

	30 Days Completers Only			90 Days Completers Only			
Employer Category	Total Completers	No. Retentions	No. Transfers	No. Still With SWP Employer	No. With Same Non-SWP Employer As 30 Days	No. With Different Employer Than 30 Day	No. Empl'd At 30 days But are now Unemployed
Education	71	24 (34%)	12 (17%)	19 (27%)	8 (11%)	1	3
Social Service & Day Care	47	20 (43%)	11 (23%)	11 (23%)	10 (21%)	2	0
Health & Allied Services	68	46 (68%)	15 (22%)	33 (49%)	11 (16%)	3	3
State Gov't	46	16 (35%)	14 (30%)	12 (26%)	8 (17%)	2	1
Municipal Gov't	14	6	6	3	3	0	2
Other	11	3	1	2	1	1	0
TOTAL	257	115 (45%)	59 (23%)	80 (31%)	41 (16%)	9 (4%)	9 (4%)

NOTE: 90 day data not available on all clients for whom 30 day data listed.

TABLE 10

SWP Placements (Retentions & Transfers) By Employer Group Breakdown As of 12/4/72

(30 & 90 Day Status)

	30 Days Completers Only			90 Days Completers Only			
Employer Category	Total Completers	No. Retentions	No. Transfers	No. Still With SWP Employer	No. W/Same Non-SWP Employer As 30 Days	No. W/Diff. Employer Than 30 Days	No. Empl'd At 30 Days But are now Unempl'd
Education 1-12	51	13 (25%)	9 (18%)	10 (20%)	6	1	3
Education (College)	20	11 (55%)	3 (15%)	9 (45%)	2	0	0
Hospital	54	38 (70%)	11 (20%)	26 (48%)	7	3	3
Other Health	14	8 (57%)	4 (29%)	7	4	0	0
State Gov't.-Health	5	2	0	2	0	0	0
State Gov't.- Voc. Rehab.	5	1	3	0	2	0	0
Child Care-Day Care	17	8 (47%)	2	4	2	0	0
CAA-Day Care	3	0	1	0	1	0	0
CAA-Other	20	8 (40%)	5 (25%)	4	5	2	0
Social Services	4	3	1	2	1	0	0
State Gov't.-Soc. Serv.	8	1	5	1	2	1	1
State Gov't.-DES	9	2 (22%)	4 (44%)	2	2	0	0
Youth Services	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
Char./Nonprofit F. R.	2	1	0	1	0	0	0
Legal Services	2	0	2	0	1	0	0
State Gov't.-Other	19	10 (53%)	2	7	2	1	0
City Gov't.	9	6 (67%)	3	3	1	0	2
Regional Devel.	5	0	3	0	2	0	0
Oth.	9	2	1	1	1	1	0
TOTALS	257	115	59	80	41	9	9

related factors, and not with the nature of the particular type of job. The four most important factors with the State Hospital are:

1. Size: Being a large institution, it provides a wide range of jobs and a good rate of turnover. A good number of vacancies in a variety of fields regularly become available for SWP completers to step into.

2. Funding: Being a large institution, the Hospital has a very substantial budget. Funds are more readily available for taking on and retaining new personnel than would be the case in a smaller organization with a rigid and limited budget.

3. Devotion of time by project staff: A full-time E&D Coach spends a large amount of her time at the Hospital attending to the trainee's needs and coordinating SWP training activities with hospital operations. She sees to it that when a vacancy occurs, a fully prepared SWP completer is ready and waiting.

4. Attitude of hospital management: The management and staff of the Hospital are generally receptive to, and enthusiastic about, the SWP program and are prepared to make the concessions and adjustments necessary for the attainment of the project's goals. This cooperation has been of critical importance in view of the fact that, with many hospital jobs, State competitive merit system requirements must be met before a completer can be permanently retained. Management cooperation and intensive efforts toward preparing trainees for meeting the competitive requirements are responsible for the fact that trainees at the Hospital have been generally successful in overcoming this obstacle.

In the case of the health services agency retention rate, the basic "success" factors seem to be related to budget and attitude (receptivity). For the most part, these agencies are well established and have access to reliable and continuous sources of (government) funding (Community Mental Health, Planned Parenthood, Visiting Nurse Association, etc.). Their regular funding patterns enable them to make the necessary fiscal preparations for taking on successful completers. Attitude is also an important factor here, both from the standpoint of assisting the trainee through the "training" period, and the positive desire to retain a disadvantaged individual who has "proven" himself. These are for the most part small, "intimate" organizations whose objective is consistent with those of the SWP program: serving the needs of (often) disadvantaged individuals. There is a carry-over of attitudes in these small

"people-serving" organizations which works to the benefit of SWP trainees.

All the other major categories on TABLE 9 show retention rates well under 50%. Looking at the more detailed categories on TABLE 10, we find three other categories with retention rates in excess of 50%: "Education (College)" at 55%, "State Government - Other" at 53% and "City Government" at 67%.

The category of "State Government - Other" includes slots with a large number of different State agencies, but unlike the other State Government categories, these jobs were predominantly clerical. While the project has generally had a relatively poor experience in placements with State agencies, it appears here that State clerical jobs were an exception. The apparent explanation lies in the labor market and the State's merit service requirements. The State exams for clerical jobs are less rigorous and more job skills-related than those for many other State jobs, and the SWP job experience seems to have adequately prepared the trainees for scoring well on them. Also, since the labor surplus in Vermont for clerical work was not as great as in most other types of State work, the competition for these jobs was probably not as keen. SWP training gave completers in clerical fields the necessary "edge" in competing for available jobs.

While the project has not had sufficient experience with municipal government employers, most projections point to local government as a rapidly growing source of a wide variety of employment opportunities in the decade ahead. (See Occupational Handbook 1972-73 Edition, U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 847). Although, as mentioned earlier, EEA jobs precluded SWP experience in this field, the high retention rate (67%) SWP realized with the few municipal slots would tend to bear out these projections.

How do we explain the low retention rates in the various other categories? Let's look at each of them closely.

Pre-college education (grades 1-12) shows a retention rate of only 25%. The explanation lies in the economic crisis locally-funded public education is undergoing. Most of the SWP slots were for aides of one sort or another, positions which simply don't survive the squeeze in the annual local school budget cycle. It should be noted, however, that clerical and unskilled (maintenance) jobs in public schools fared somewhat higher in retention rates than classroom aide jobs.

In the category of "Social Services and Day Care," most of which involved nursery school and day care jobs with small "neighborhood" facilities and OEO-funded centers, the reason for the low (43%) retention rate again can be traced to size and budgetary factors. Two almost universal traits of these small day care operations have been: (1) small staffs and

lack of turnover (and consequently no job vacancies), and (2) very tight, limited budgets. This latter characteristic is particularly true of the many day care organizations dependent upon federal OEO funding for survival. At best such funding can be described as tenuous, certainly not a situation conducive to the creation of new permanent jobs for SWP completers.

State government would, by most every criteria, appear to be an ideal employer for a SWP-type manpower program. However, with the exception of clerical jobs (mentioned above), this has not been the case; our figures show a 35% retention rate. Consensus of SWP field staff points to one reason: the State "merit system" requirements of open, competitive examinations for almost all job vacancies. It has been pointed out that in the clerical jobs (comprising a large part of the "State Government - Other" category), SWP trainees have been pretty successful on the clerical examinations. However, the other State Government categories are heavily weighted with jobs in the paraprofessional field (case aides, coach trainees, etc.). State "merit service" exams for these positions are much more general education and aptitude oriented than are the (job oriented) clerical tests, putting our SWP clients at a much greater disadvantage. The problem is compounded by the fact that competition for these jobs is fierce, SWP trainees fighting for places on hiring registers against large numbers of highly educated and qualified applicants (due to the economic downturn). While the job openings in these fields in Vermont are scarce, overqualified applicants are certainly plentiful.

B. Duration of Placements

It is impossible to come to any firm conclusions concerning durations of placements (either retentions or transfers) from the very limited 90 day information available at the time of this writing. It can, however, be seen from what is available (TABLE 10) that there is no significant variation in the rates of "drop out" between 90 and 30 day status, the rates for employees continuing in their 30 day jobs being consistently high for all types of employers. This writer would conjecture that, based on data available, type of job or employer would be factors of minimal significance to the question of duration of placements.

C. Transferability

The question here is which types of employers or jobs seemed to have offered work experiences or skill training which most easily facilitates "transfer" into jobs on the open job market. Although the SWP program's thrust has been toward securing retentions, and consequently we have very little data on transfers, project experience enables us to make some generalizations.

In a tight labor market situation, employers can, and do, insist upon "experienced applicants only" in filling most of

their job vacancies. Experience, to these employers, means experience in the particular type of job to be filled. SWP training certainly does provide the trainees with work experience, "real" job experience which a job-seeking completer can document on a job application. The key to the question is, therefore, which types of SWP jobs provide experience in the fields for which job openings exist?

The consensus of field project personnel is that SWP clerical jobs provide trainees with the best chances for "outside" employment. The relatively high rate of transfer in "State Government" (30%) is attributable to a good number of clerical training completers who were successful in finding new jobs. In a generally unfavorable job market in Vermont in recent years, clerical employment is one of the areas presenting the most favorable picture (from the standpoint of the range of SWP job-types, at least).

Jobs in small, social services oriented fields (with community action agencies, welfare, rehabilitation, health and mental health organizations) are felt to provide beneficial transfer advantage to trainees. The reason does not relate so much to the job market although the employment picture for jobs in these fields has been looking more and more favorable in recent years, as to effects of training in such jobs upon the trainees. Working closely with people in an organization whose object is to serve people's personal needs has a very beneficial effect upon the outlooks and motivations of trainees, and seems to lead to more stable work histories. This may be true whether or not the trainee pursues the same or a different type of work.

Two areas which seem to present very bleak pictures as far as transfer is concerned are day care and public education involving child care and classroom-aide jobs. There simply is not a decent market, in Vermont at least, for such "skills". Neither public schools nor day care facilities (public or private) have sufficient available funds to create a substantial source of employment in these fields.

SWP training might well have provided work experience of value to trainees in obtaining employment in a much wider variety of occupations in the private, profit-making sector of the economy. The project was limited, however, to the public and nonprofit sector, involving but a few skills transferable to the profitmaking private sector. Clerical work was one such area. In most other areas, the skills and experiences imparted have transfer value only to other similar public and nonprofit fields. While Vermont does provide a relatively favorable employment picture in the public and nonprofit sectors (relative, that is, to the limited availability of private employment in this rural State), the market for available jobs is glutted with highly qualified, educated job seekers, many from out-of-state (Vermont, of late, has had a high immigration rate). The competition is especially stiff in jobs for "Pro-

fessional Assistants and Aides", the category in which the highest percentage of SWP slots was concentrated (36%). It is unrealistic to expect a high degree of success in preparing SWP clients, a high percentage of whom are disadvantaged to begin with, to compete on an even footing in a job market like this.

As one experienced Counselor stated, it is too much to expect SWP to be a mechanism for substantially improving a disadvantaged unemployed's chances on the job market. Its strong advantage is that of a placement "tool", helping a trainee to get his"foot in the door" with an employer by whom he may be retained.

SECTION VII

JOB SATISFACTION

The purpose of this chapter is to seek to identify any preference (or lack of preference) among SWP trainees for particular types of placements or careers.

It should be noted that SWP Counselors made every attempt to place clients in only those slots which were compatible with their desires, preferences, backgrounds, etc. Thus the data available is hardly the product of a random experiment.

The Booz-Allen client survey posed the following pertinent questions: To clients (130 terminators and completers), it asked, "How satisfied were you with the work you were doing on your SWP job?" (Question 13A) and "If you had your choice, would you have picked this particular SWP job?" (Question 14). Of Counselors, it asked "Do you think this slot was satisfactory to this client in terms of his desires and preferences?" (Question 25). TABLE 11 shows a tabulation of the responses by one-digit DOT code categories (job types). (The figures under the category "Structural Work" are misleading and should not be considered for our present purposes.) The figures show that in all three major categories of jobs (digits 0 & 1, 2 and 3), the majority of responses to each question were positive. Given the limitations of the data (variations of types of jobs within categories), it would be dangerous to make generalizations beyond these:

-Counselors felt that, in terms of desires and preferences, more clients were suited to "Professional, Technical and Managerial, and Clerical" jobs than to "Service" jobs. (There were no "Sales" occupations involved in the project).

-Trainees in "Service" slots were particularly happy with the work their jobs involved.

-Of the three major categories, trainees in "Professional, Technical and Managerial" jobs were least likely to have freely chosen the type of work they were in (this category is heavily weighted with classroom aide and day care aide slots).

Another question 13 (H) in the Booz-Allen survey asked of clients: "How satisfied were you with the job skills learned on your SWP job?". While tabulation of responses is not deemed of sufficient significance to reproduce here, the

TABLE 11

Question 13 (A) - Asked of SWP Clients (130 Completers and Terminators)
Question 14 - Asked of SWP Clients (130 Completers and Terminators)
Question 25 - Asked of SWP Counselors (re 130 Completers and Terminators)
Booz-Allen Survey Data

Type of Job (1 digit DOT Code)	13(A)			14			25		
	Satisfied	Dissatis.	Total*	Yes	No	Total*	Yes	No	Total*
Professional, Tech. & Mngrl. (0 & 1)	14 (67%)	3 (14%)	21	11(52%)	9(43%)	21	20 (80%)	5(20%)	25
Clerical & Sales (2)	17 (68%)	6 (24%)	25	15(60%)	8(32%)	25	22 (79%)	4(14%)	28
Service (3)	49 (78%)	8 (13%)	63	38(61%)	21(34%)	62	45 (65%)	20(29%)	69
Farming, Fishing, Forestry & Related (4)	0	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	2
Processing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Machine Trades (6)	0	2	2	1	1	2	2	0	2
Bench Work (7)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Structural Work (8)	10	6	17	9	8	17	8	9	19
Miscellaneous (9)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Question 13(A) : "How satisfied were you with the work you were doing on your SWP job?"
14 : "If you had your choice, would you have picked this particular SWP job?"
25 : "Do you think this slot was satisfactory to this client in terms of his desires and preferences?"

*Total includes other responses.

following observations of those responses are interesting:

-The degree of satisfaction with skills learned was generally lower in most categories than the degrees of satisfaction with the work the trainees were doing (Question 13A above). This presumably reflects the lack of emphasis upon skill development through the SWP project.

-Of the major categories, the highest degrees of satisfaction with skills learned were in slots with hospitals and in clerical work slots. This corroborates the findings listed in the chapter on "Training/Work Experience Potential" concerning the skill development capabilities in these areas.

This section can be concluded by summarizing some of the main observations made by field personnel with respect to SWP job satisfaction:

-Many felt that day care aide and classroom aide jobs were low on the satisfaction range since they were too similar to the at-home child tending chores of the mothers who were commonly put in these slots.

-Clerical jobs were felt to be particularly satisfying, as a result of their enabling the trainee to participate in a "formal" office setting, getting dressed up daily, etc. This was seen as being especially true of women working in State offices.

-Jobs involving tending to the needs and problems of people on an individual basis (case aides, counselor trainees, interviewers, etc. in social service-related agencies, Planned Parenthood, Employment Service, etc.) were felt to be high on the satisfaction scale.

-It was felt by some that satisfaction would have been generally higher had it been possible to create a much greater variety of jobs, and thus match trainees to jobs more closely akin to their past employment experience. The range of jobs the project was able to create within the public and nonprofit sectors was too limited to facilitate this to the desired degree.

SECTION VIII

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL CONCLUS[redacted]

A. Distribution of Types of J[redacted] and Employers

1. Types of Employers:

-During the project, the highest percentage of job slots were developed in "Education" (33%), most of these with elementary and secondary schools.

-Almost as many slots were in "Health and Allied Services" (29%), a great many of these were developed in the Waterbury State Hospital.

-Remaining slots were in "Social Services and Day Care" (19%), "State Government" ten percent, and "Municipal Government" five percent, and "Miscellaneous," five percent.

2. Types of Jobs:

-Largest percent of slots (36%) were "Professional Aides and Assistants," many being child care aides, teachers' classroom aides, nurses' aides, etc.

-Very few "Professional and Management" slots were created, four percent.

-Remaining slots were distributed between "Clerical" (21%), "Unskilled" (20%), and "Semi-Skilled" (18%).

3. Distribution of Jobs by Types of Employers:

-In Education, most jobs were "Professional Assistants and Aides" (53%, mostly classroom aides).

-In Social Services and Day Care, the highest percentage of jobs were in the category of "Professional Assistants and Aides" (37%, a category including many day care aides).

-In Health and Allied Services, again "Professional

Assistants and Aides" accounted for the highest percentage of slots (44%, including many hospital aides, case aides, nutrition aides and rehabilitation aides).

-In State Government (other than health-related) the highest percentage of slots were "Clerical," (53%).

-In Local Government, very few slots of any type were created during the project.

B. Training/Work Experience Potential

1. Employability Development -- Generally:

-Jobs in elementary and secondary schools rate low as far as ability to assist in overall employability development.

-Higher education jobs (in colleges, universities, etc.) rate high.

-Social Service-related jobs are rated favorably from the standpoint of employability development.

-Clerical work is also considered very helpful.

-Professional, technical and managerial slots ("paraprofessionals" accounting for many jobs here) were viewed favorably.

-Service jobs were rated generally poor.

2. Attitude of Employers:

-"Efficiency" oriented jobs and employers were deemed less likely to possess favorable attitudes than ones that involved serving the needs and problems of individuals.

-Attitudes of co-workers as perceived by trainees, rated uniformly high with all types of employers.

-Attitudes in an organization's "front office" often were different from attitudes of actual job site supervisors.

-Anti-"welfare type" attitude arises occasionally in various types of organizations: such employers must be detected and "weeded-out" by Manpower Specialists before subcontracts are negotiated with them.

3. "World of Work" Orientation:

-Some SWP clients are not lacking in orientation to work, but are unemployed for other reasons (employment "barriers" or poor job market).

-For trainees lacking such orientation, a job involving a structured work routine is beneficial in instilling desirable work habits.

-Clerical jobs were deemed beneficial in improving work habits and inspiring pride.

-"Paraprofessional" jobs improve motivation and morale.

-Neither day care and classroom aide jobs, nor "make work" slots were seen as being of value in improving outlook or attitude toward work.

4. Skill Training:

-Clerical work was the only area tending to significantly assist in acquisition of skills (though skill training was not a major aim of SWP).

C. Wage Levels

1. In-Training Wages:

-Almost all SWP slot wages were in the $2.00 - $2.40 per hour range.

-Municipal jobs (the few that there were) tended toward the high end of the range.

-Clerical wages were mid-range.

-Classroom aide and day care worker wages were generally low.

2. Post-Project Changes in Earnings of Completers:

-Data in most categories is inadequate to show any real trends. In those areas where data is available, wage changes 90 days after completion is negligible.

3. Percentage of Slot Subsidy:

-Very few slots were subsidized at a level below 90% of costs. Variation is not sufficient to show any relationship between level of subsidy and "desirability" of employers.

D. Supervisory Resources

1. Size of Group of Co-Workers Under Same Supervisor:

-Size of groups of trainees' co-workers overall tended to be small (67% in two to ten employees/ supervisor range).

-Groups in hospitals tended to be relatively large.

-Groups of employees under same supervisor tended to be relatively small in other health-related organizations, and in elementary and secondary schools.

-Groups in State government were at extreme ends of the spectrum, tending to be either large or small, depending upon the particular agency.

-Irrespective of size of the group under the same supervisor, the retention of the element of human contact was deemed to be of critical importance to the value of the work experience upon the trainee.

2. Quality of Supervision:

-Supervision deemed to be of generally high "quality" in nearly all employer categories.

-Hospitals ratedespecially high as far as willingness to help client and teaching of job skills (State Hospital at Waterbury, a mental institution, providing the principal experience).

-All types of employers were seen as being adequately prepared to deal with problems clients brought to the job (especially so, again, in the case of the large mental hospital).

-Employers judged as best equipped to serve SWP clients' needs were either (or both): (1) large, having access to many resources, or (2) social service oriented (concerned with handling "people" problems).

E. Placement Rates (Retention and Transferability)

1. Retention by SWP Employers were found to be high in the following categories and for the following reasons:

-Hospitals, in particular, the large State Hospital at Waterbury (Mental Hospital) because of the size

of its overall payroll (turnover in large number of jobs involving a fairly wide range of occupations), size of its total budget (certain source of continued funding and "room" for adding new positions), and very desirable attitude on the part of management and staff (of assistance in overcoming obstacles of the State Merit System requirements).

-Small health and health-related agencies, because of reliable, regular sources of funding, and desirable attitudes toward "types" of clients enrolled.

-Large institutions of higher learning, because of large payroll (turnover and wide range of jobs) and substantial budgets.

-State government clerical jobs, because of continued sources of funding, favorable job market picture for clerical skills, and Merit Service obstacles not as imposing in clerical fields.

2. Retention rates were found to be low in the following areas, for the reasons stated:

-Elementary and secondary schools (classroom aid jobs) because of limitations of local funding.

-Day care, because of limited finances of these typically small facilities (also, lack of personnel turnover).

-State government (other than clerical), because of difficulties SWP clients have with "Merit Service" competitive examinations.

3. Duration of Placements:

-At this stage in the documentation of project experience, data is too limited to permit generalizations as to duration of placements. Based on limited data available, duration rates appear consistently high among all types of employers.

4. Transferability (placements in other employment)

-Range of public service jobs in SWP is not sufficiently broad to adequately test potentials for transferability of skills to private sector employment.

-Clerical skills appear to offer best chances of transfer.

-Day care and classroom aide jobs deemed of little value from transfer potential standpoint as well as case aides with various State Agencies.

-As far as transfer from SWP to similar public and nonprofit employment, competition for available jobs in Vermont presently is too stiff to allow SWP completers to fare well.

F. Job Satisfaction

-Majority in all job categories expressed satisfaction generally.

-As far as desires and preferences of clients, "Professional, Technical and Managerial" category slots rated highest.

-Trainees in "service" jobs were happiest with the work they were doing.

-Of major categories, those in "Professional, Technical and Managerial" were least likely to have picked the field they were placed in (result attributed to many "aide" jobs in this category).

-Clerical work was deemed very "satisfying," as were jobs in small agencies serving the needs of individuals.

-Staff felt higher degree of satisfaction could be attained if wider range of jobs were available.

G. Final Summary

The main objective of the Special Work Project being to secure retentions; the best types of employers for this purpose are those which have access to large, continuing and reliable sources of funding, employ large numbers of people, having reasonable degree of turnover (thus job vacancies) and a wide range of jobs, and possess favorable attitude toward people, that of tolerance to disadvantaged or problem individuals.

In addition to this main consideration (factors relating to retention), there are many employer and job-related factors which have been identified as having a bearing upon the "value" of a program like SWP upon its participants. This paper has sought to identify and set forth those factors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Occupational Handbook 1972-1973 Edition.
U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1973.

Stanfield, Robert. The Uses of Paraprofessionals In the Delivery of Manpower and Social Services Through Public Service Employment: The Vermont Experience. Vermont Department of Employment Security, 1973.

"Study of the Vermont Manpower Experimental and Demonstration Project," a report prepared by Booz-Allen Public Administration Services Inc., Washington, D. C. for the Vermont Department of Employment Security, September, 1973.